DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 058 CS 504 032

AUTHOR Edwards, Renee; Barker, Larry
TITLE A Rating of Doctoral Programs in Speech Communication: 1982.
PUB DATE Nov 82
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (68th, Louisville, KY, November 4-7, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Doctoral Programs; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; *Speech Communication; Speech Curriculum; Speech Instruction; Surveys

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to update previous rankings of speech communication doctoral programs. Subjects were a random selection of every sixth name on the Speech Communication Association (SCA) membership list, and members of the SCA who have been the first authors of journal articles in the SCA journals in the past 10 years. In addition to academic and biographical data, the questionnaire solicited ratings of doctoral programs in eight areas: (1) rhetorical and communication theory, (2) interpersonal communication, (3) organizational communication, (4) mass communication, (5) public address, (6) communication education, (7) oral interpretation, and (8) overall quality. Subjects were also asked to rate in order the top five doctoral programs on overall quality. A total of 415 responses were returned from the 2 sample groups. The majority of the random sample respondents were male, assistant professors with Ph.D.s, and most interested in the area of rhetorical and communication theory. Most of the respondents in the first author sample were male professors, also with Ph.D.s and also interested primarily in rhetorical and communication theory. Among the results, the random sample subjects rated the University of Wisconsin, University of Iowa, and Northwestern University programs highest in overall quality. First authors ranked the Wisconsin, Iowa, and University of Illinois programs at highest in overall quality. (Tables indicating program ranking by the two groups in each of the eight areas are included.) (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224058

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A RATING OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION: 1982

by

Renee Edwards

and

Larry Barker

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Renee Edwards
Larry Barker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association/Association for Communication Administration, Louisville, Kentucky, November, 1982.

Ms. Edwards is Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication and Theatre at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro. Mr. Barker is Professor in the Department of Speech Communication at Auburn University. The authors wish to gratefully acknowledge the Communication Research Center at Southwest Texas State University for its assistance and support.

CS504032

Six years ago, a survey was conducted to evaluate doctoral programs in the speech communication discipline.[1] A second similar survey was conducted in 1978.[2] Graduate departments were rated and ranked by members of the Speech Communication Association on overall quality as well as in several content areas and methodologies. The results identified perceived leading departments in doctoral education in speech communication. The present study, commissioned by the Association for Communication Administration (which also sponsored the two previous surveys in 1976, and 1978) was designed to update the results of the earlier surveys.

A primary purpose of the two previous surveys was to provide usable information for Deans, department heads, and prospective graduate students. The American Council on Education (ACE) conducted similar research in other disciplines and found that Deans and department heads used the results to justify allocations of resources. The ACE report also indicated that some graduate students examined the results when attempting to select graduate programs appropriate to their interests.[3]

A basic assumption underlying the present and previous surveys is that evaluation by peers in the profession of speech communication is a valid and reliable indicator of quality. A survey conducted by ACE tested this assumption and found that peer ratings correlated positively with publication records, with faculty salaries, and with other "objective" measures of departmental quality.[4] In fact, peer evaluation was found to extend beyond objective criteria by reflecting a broader range of departmental quality. Some "objective" measures are heavily weighted in favor of a few programs and may tend to exaggerate differences in program effectiveness.[5]

Assessments of educational quality are ultimately subjective processes. Quality is a complex construct and its operationalization can vary from

researcher to researcher. There is no one index or combination of indices which can adequately or completely reflect quality of an academic program. Although peer evaluations in the past have been used successfully as indicators of quality, it should be emphasized that they represent only one dimension of an elusive variable. No claim is being made here that the data reported in this paper can be used in probative argument.

Methods and Procedures

Sample

Two different samples were drawn for this survey. The first was a random sample of Speech Communication Association members and was drawn by selecting every sixth name from the membership list. This sample consisted of 614 subjects and will be referred to, in this report, as the "Random" Sample. The second sample included members of the Speech Communication Association who have been the first authors of journal articles in either Communication Education, Communication Monographs or the Quarterly Journal of Speech during the past ten years. A list of first authors was compiled (duplications of names were eliminated) and randomly sampled. This sample, consisting of 123 subjects, will be referred to, hereafter, as the "First Author" Sample.

Twenty subjects appeared in both samples. They received the same mailings as the Random Sample, but their responses were tabulated for both samples.

The Instrument

The questionnaire was adapted from those used in the previous communication survey and in the ACE studies. Part I requested academic and biographical data: rank, title, age, sex, professional meetings attended, publications, source of highest degree and employer.

Part II was devoted to the ratings of doctoral programs in eight areas:

(1) Rhetorical and Communication Theory; (2) Interpersonal Communication; (3) Organizational Communication; (4) Mass Communication; (5) Public Address; (6) Communication Education; (7) Oral Interpretation; and (8) Overall Quality. In a preliminary survey, Deans, department chairpersons and directors of graduate studies identified the areas to be included for their respective institutions.[6] Areas not offered were crossed out on the questionnaire. Programs were rated in Overall Quality only if they offered four or more of the specific areas. A six point scale was provided with the following levels: (1) Distinguished; (2) Strong; (3) Good; (4) Adequate; (5) Marginal; and (6) Not sufficient for doctoral training. Subjects were instructed to leave spaces blank if they did not have enough information to rate a given program.

Part III of the questionnaire requested additional information. Subjects were asked to rank order the top five doctoral programs on Overall Quality. They were also asked to identify their major interest or background according to the areas listed above. Finally, an optional question gave subjects the opportunity to identify the criteria they had used in making their evalutions.

Methods

Each subject was mailed a questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter which explained the purpose of the survey and requested participation. All subjects received addressed return envelopes which were marked with their return address. Subjects in the First Author sample received a stamped envelope while those for the Random Sample were unstamped. Approximately six weeks later, follow-up letters were mailed to all subjects who had not responded. These contained a copy of the questionnaire, a second letter and an unstamped marked return envelope.

Results

Rate of Return

Of the original Random Sample of 614, 322 or 52% responded in some form; 57% of these responded to the questionnaire and evaluated at least one doctoral program. Several factors may account for the rate of return. First, as was expressed by many subjects who responded but did not complete the questionnaire, subjects may have lacked information and felt unqualified to evaluate doctoral programs. Second, the questionnaire was moderately lengthy and required thought as well as time to complete. Finally, subjects may not have perceived the importance of the project.

Of the First Author Sample of 123, 93 or 76% responded in some form; 88% of these responded to the questionnaire and evaluated at least one doctoral program. Others may not have responded for the same reasons as noted with regard to the Random Sample.

Sample Characteristics

On the basis of Part I of the questionnaire, the following characteristics of the samples were determined.

Random Sample

Academic Rank and Title. Analysis of the 184 randomly selected subjects who responded revealed that 21% were professors; 28% associate professors; 36% assistant professors; 6% instructors; and 16% "other." Department chairpersons accounted for 23% of the sample.

Age and Sex. The average age was 40.6 (s.d. = 11.24). Sixty-seven per cent of the respondents were male; 33% female.

Professional Meetings Attended. Members of the Random Sample attended an average of 2.7 regional meetings and 3.3 national meetings in the past 4

years.

Publications. Randomly selected subjects reported that they had published an average of 0.7 book reviews in the past four years, 1.0 books or monographs and 5.97 articles since the award of their highest degree.

Insert

Highest Degree Earned. Ph.D.'s accounted for 78% of the Random Sample; Master's degrees 16%; with the remainder split between Ed.D.'s, bachelor's degrees and "Other."

Area of Interest. Twenty-four per cent of the Random Sample identified with Rhetorical and Communication Theory; 19% with Interpersonal Communication; 9% each with Organizational Communication and Radio-TV-Film (Mass Communication); 15% with Public Address; 4% with Communication Education; 7% with Oral Interpretation and 12% with "Other."

First Author Sample

Academic Rank and Title. Analysis of the respondents in the First Author Sample revealed that 40% were Professors; 38% Associate Professors; and 22% Assistant Professors. Department chairpersons accounted for 28% of the First Author Sample.

Age and Sex. The average age was 42.46 (s.d. = 10.57). Eighty-three per cent of the respondents were male; 17% were female.

Professional Meetings Attended. Members of the First Author Sample attended an average of 3.8 regional meetings and 4.4 national meetings in the last four years.

Publications. Respondents reported that they had published an average of 1.57 book reviews in the past four years, 2.6 books or monographs and 15.48 articles since receiving their highest degree.

Highest Degree Earned. Ph.D.'s accounted for 98% of the First Author

Sample; Ed.D. and "other" each accounted for 2%.

Area of Interest. Thirty-nine per cent of the First Author Sample responded that their primary interest was Rhetorical and Communication Theory; 20% identified Interpersonal Communication; 19% Public Address; 7% Communication Education; 5% "Other"; 4% each Radio-TV-Film (Mass Communication) and Oral Interpretation; and 3% Organizational Communication.

Program Evaluations

Tables 1 through 18 present the results of the ratings and rankings of the universities in the areas of communication which they offer at the doctoral level. Tables 1 through 9 report the results for the Random Sample, while Tables 10 through 18 report the results for the First Author Sample.

Ratings

Tables 1 through 8 and 10 through 17 present the results of the ratings of programs. Tables 1 and 10 present the results for Rhetorical and Communication Theory; Tables 2 and 11 relate to Interpersonal Communication; Tables 3 and 12 contain the results for Organizational Communication; Tables 4 and 13 present Radio-TV-Film (Mass Communication) results; Tables 5 and 14 include the Public Address results; Tables 6 and 15 contain the results for Communication Education; Tables 7 and 16 present the results for Oral Interpretation; and Tables 8 and 17 are for Overall Quality.

Column 1 of each table lists the universities in the order of most positive to least positive score; Column 2 lists the mean ratings; Column 3 reports the standard deviation; Column 4 indicates how many subjects evaluated the program. In the case of ties, universities are listed in alphabetical order.

Ranking

Tables 9 and 18 present the results of the rankings made by subjects of the top 5 programs. Column 1 lists universities who were mentioned at least 5 times; mentions were deleted if they were for an institution where the rater received his/her highest degree or where currently employed. The programs are listed according to the number of times they were ranked, in the order of most to least. Column 2 presents the number of times a program was mentioned and Column 3 contains the mean rankings.

Discussion

The results of the survey, reflected in the preceding tables, may be analyzed in a variety of different ways. First, the results of the present survey may be compared to the results from the two earlier surveys.[7] This comparison should be made with caution, however, because slight differences in sampling procedures occurred among the three different surveys conducted among speech communication professionals. A major difference among the surveys was that the initial survey did not include a First Author sample.

Results from the First Author Sample also may be compared to those of the Random Sample in the present survey. Ratings made by the randomly selected subjects tended to be higher and reflect a smaller range of the scale than did those of the first authors. The two groups overlapped in their judgments of programs, although differences in rank ordering did occur.

When interpreting the results, several variables should be taken into consideration. The first is the possibility of a "halo" effect which could occur when an individual specializing in one area evaluates a program in a different area. The quality of the program with which the rater is most

familiar could possibly influence his or her evaluation of other areas in a given department. Results from the 1976 and 1978 survey demonstrated the importance of this effect.

A second factor which may have influenced results is the possibility of a "time lag" between previous information or perception of a given program and the reality of the program quality at the time of the survey. Departments are changing constantly, but awareness of those changes may occur several years after the fact. In particular, professors may move from a given department uwithout a large segment of the discipline knowing about the departure until months or even years later. Consequently, evaluations in the present study may reflect programs as they were some time ago rather than as they are right now. On the basis of his research with the American Council on Education, Cartter concluded that reputations do not lag greatly for departments that have gained or lost distinguished faculty members, but they may lag for programs which have added or subtracted promising younger scholars.[8]

An additional factor which may have influenced the results of the present survey is the influence of the two earlier surveys published in the ACA Bulletin and in Communication Education. Subjects familiar with the results from the earlier studies may have based their judgments in 1982, in part, on them. Although the actual awareness of results from the earlier studies among speech communication professionals can not be accurately assessed, the possibility exists that the previous surveys might have had some small influence on the present results.

In analyzing or using the results from this survey, caution should be exercised. Although there are minimal standards necessary for training doctoral candidates, at some point factors other than those reflected in peer ratings and rankings should be considered. These factors include areas of

specialization, financial support, library and computer facilities, faculty time available for students, publications of the faculty, jobs obtained by graduates, and professional leadership in the discipline among faculty, to name but a few.

As was noted earlier quality may be operationalized in a variety of ways. The definition in this survey reflects only peer evaluations and must be interpreted accordingly. Presumably, however, any complete evaluation of graduate programs would include peer evaluations as one important dimension of overall quality.

Finally, the authors would like to extend a cautionary note about reporting specific rankings and ratings identified in the Tables. The scores should be considered in terms of ranges (e.g., top, middle and bottom thirds) rather than as indicative of quality to the "nth" degree. Programs may be ranked two or even three places apart in the tables, but careful attention to the mean ratings and standard deviations may indicate that they are very close and indistinguishable in terms of quality.

Footnotes

[1]Renee Edwards and Larry L. Barker, "A Rating of Doctoral Programs in Speech Communication, 1976" ACA Bulletin, April, 1977, 59-69.

[2]Renee Edwards and Larry L. Barker, "A Rating of Doctoral Programs in Speech Communication, 1978: Part I," ACA Bulletin, October, 1979, 23-34; and Renee Edwards and Larry Barker, "Some Perceptions of Highly Regarded Doctoral Programs in Speech Communication," Communication Education, September, 1979, 301-305.

[3]Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Anderson, A Rating of Graduate Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, 1970), p. 2.

[4]Allan Murray Cartter, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966), p. 9.

[5]Cartter, p. 10.

[6]The Annenberg School of Communication (East) at the University of Pennsylvania chose not to be included in the survey, even though it offers a doctoral degree in communication.

[7]c.f. Edwards and Barker, ACA Bulletin, 1977; Edwards and Barker, ACA Bulletin, 1979; and Edwards and Barker, Communication Education, 1979.

[8]Cartter.

TABLE 1. RHETORICAL AND COMMUNICATION THEORY, RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	Northwestern University	1.18	.80	114
2.	U. of Wisconsin	1.52	.79	94
3.	U. of Iowa	1.53	.78	105
4.	U. of Illinois	1.84	1.07	97
5.	U. of Minnesota	1.86	.87	93
6.	Pennsylvania State U.	1.89	.84	85
7.	U. of Texas	2.16	.91	85
8.	Indiana University	2.22	.97	82
8.	U. of Utah	2.22	.97	74
10.	U. of Washington	2.24	.64	62
11.	U. of Massachusetts	2.27	.89	75
12.	U. of Kansas	2.32	1.00	84
13.	Ohio State U.	2.41	.84	93
14.	Temple University	2.43	.93	75
15.	Purdue University	2.47	.88	97
16.	U. of Pittsburgh	2.55	.92	62
17.	Carnegie-Mellon U.	2.74	1.15	31
18.	Louisiana State U.	2.90	1.16	57
19.	Florida State U.	3.00	1.24	71
19.	U. of California,Berkeley	3.00	1.09	63
21.	Ohio University	3.01	1.02	71
21.	U. of Denver	3.01	1.25	83
23.	Southern Illinois U.	3.04	.99	73
23.	U. of Maryland	3.04	1.19	55
25.	U. of Oregon	3.06	1.26	51
26.	U. of Oklahoma	3.08	1.02	51
27.	U. of Missouri	3.10	1.13	57
28.	U. of Colorado	3.22	1.10	65
28.	Wayne State U.	3.22	1.06	54
30.	U. of Nebraska	3.25	.99	61
31.	U. of Arizona	3.42	1.10	57
32.	Bowling Green State U.	3.54	1.22	56
33.	U. of Kentucky	3.57	1.16	54
34.	SUNY, Buffalo	3.63	1.09	41
35.	Kent State U.	3.66	1.17	50
35.	U. of Florida	3.66	1.19	50
37.	Rensselaer Poly. Inst.	3.70	1.54	27
38.	U. of Tennessee	4.26	1.21	34
39.	North Texas State U.	4.34	1.31	32
40.	Howard University	4.46	1.01	35

TABLE 2. INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION, RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	Michigan State U.	1.71	.82	82
2.	U. of Illinois	1.86	.94	88
3.	U. of Utah	2.12	.92	74
4.	U. of Texas	2.22	.81	76
5.	Purdue University	2.25	.82	93
5.	U. of Wisconsin	2.25	.80	80
7.	Northwestern University	2.26	.95	97
8.	U. of Kansas	2.29	1.10	80
8.	U. of Washington	2.29	.74	59
10.	U. of Iowa	2.36	.98	86
11.	Tempie University	2.43	.92	65
12.	U. of Massachusetts	2.51	1.05	65
13.	Ohio State U.	2.53	.85	81
14.	U. of Minnesota	2.55	.98	83
15.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.56	.91	70
16.	Indiana University	2.66	1.00	76
17.	West Virginia U.	2.70	1.19	69
18.	U. of Southern California	2.85	.88	66
19.	Ohio University	2.92	1.08	65
20.	U. of Denver	2.93	1.13	72
21.	Florida State U.	2.98	1.08	62
22.	U. of Pittsburgh	3.06	.98	48
23.	SUNY, Albany	3.08	1.25	52
23.	U. of Oregon	3.08	1.22	48
25.	U. of Nebraska	3.09	.92	53
26.	Annenberg School, West	3.15	1.29	48
26.	U. of Oklahoma	3.15	1.03	46
28.	Southern Illinois U.	3.20	1.01	64
29.	SUNY, Buffalo	3.21	1.10	43
29.	U. of Kentucky	3.21	1.10	53
31.	U. of Maryland	3.29	.94	42
32.	Bowling Green State U.	3.31	1.17	55
33.	U. of Arizona	3.41	1.12	51
34.	Wayne State U.	3.43	1.10	49
35.	Kent State U.	3.53	1.00	47
36.	U. of Florida	3.59	1.24	46
37.	Rennselaer Poly. Inst.	4.00	1.39	21
38.	North Texas State U.	4.15	1.38	27
39.	U. of Tennessee	4.26	1.18	31

TABLE 3. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION, RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	Purdue University	1.72	.85	100
2.	Michigan State U.	2.13	.92	75
3.	U. of Texas	2.19	.92	70
4.	U. of Utah	2.35	.97	63
5.	U. of Minnesota	2.54	1.07	66
6.	U. of Kansas	2.56	.97	70
7.	U. of Illinois	2.59	1.28	69
8.	U. of Wisconsin	2.71	1.16	66
9.	Annenberg School, West	2.72	1.21	47
10.	Ohio State U.	2.82	1.04	78
11.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.87	1.18	62
12.	SUNY, Buffalo	2.88	1.33	41
13.	U. of Washington	2.94	.83	49
14.	Northwestern University	2.97	1.01	76
14.	Ohio University	2.97	1.01	60
16.	U. of Oklahoma	2.98	.82	44
17.	Indiana University	3.02	1.24	64
18.	U. of Southern California	3.10	.96	61
19.	Temple University	3.12	1.15	49
20.	U. of Iowa	3.13	1.26	75
21.	U. of Nebraska	3.19	.94	48
22.	U. of Maryland	3.20	1.05	44
23.	Florida State U.	3.21	1.22	53
24.	U. of Denver	3.22	1.08	68
25.	U. of Oregon	3.32	1.22	44
26.	West Virginia U.	3.34	1.13	53
27.	Wayne State U.	3.52	1.13	48
28.	Bowling Green State U.	3.53	1.24	51
28.	U. of Arizona	3.53	1.25	45
30.	U. of Colorado	3.56	1.18	57
31.	U. of Kentucky	3.58	1.14	45
32.	SUNY, Albany	3.70	1.37	43
33.	Kent State U.	3.71	1.17	41
34.	Oklahoma State U.	3.84	1.25	32
35.	Rennselaer Poly. Inst.	3.96	1.36	22
36.	U. of Florida	4.05	1.25	38
37.	Howard University	4.36	.87	28

TABLE 4. RADIO-TV-FILM (MASS COMMUNICATION), RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Iowa	1.98	.98	67
2.	U. of Wisconsin	2.13	1.06	62
3.	U. of Texas	2.16	1.03	62
4.	U. of Illinois	2.34	.96	50
5.	Temple University	2.35	1.07	54
6.	Michigan State U.	2.37	1.11	51
7.	Northwestern University	2.38	1.12	72
8.	Indiana University	2.47	1.18	55
9.	Ohio State U.	2.65	.99	60
9.	U. of Utah	2.65	1.12	48
11.	U. of Minnesota	2.66	.87	47
12.	Ohio University	2.69	1.07	51
13.	New York U.	2.72	1.39	29
14.	U. of Missouri	2.86	1.26	43
15.	Pennsylvania State U.	3.00	1.25	46
16.	U. of Massachusetts	3.02	1.04	44
17.	Florida State U.	3.12	1.23	41
18.	Purdue University	3.32	1.24	47
19.	Bowling Green State U.	3.36	1.19	42
20.	U. of Maryland	3.38	.94	32
21.	U. of Oregon	3.47	1.31	34
22.	Wayne State U.	3.48	1.20	40
23.	U. of Tennessee	3.64	1.31	28
24.	U. of Kentucky	3.71	1.22	42
25.	U. of Colorado	3.84	1.24	38
26.	SUNY, Buffalo	3.96	1.14	25
27.	SUNY, Albany	3.97	1.38	31
28.	North Texas State U.	4.25	1.11	24

TABLE 5. PUBLIC ADDRESS, RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Iowa	1.64	.77	91
2.	U. of Wisconsin	1.78	.92	78
3.	Northwestern U.	1.84	.79	96
4.	Indiana University	1.95	.91	76
5.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.00	.83	71
6.	U. of Minnesota	2.16	.97	68
7.	U. of Kansas	2.32	.96	66
8.	Louisiana State U.	2.44	.98	55
9.	Ohio State U.	2.48	.94	73
10.	U. of Texas	2.49	1.04	67
11.	U. of Pittsburgh	2.52	1.02	52
12.	U. of Washington	2.54	1.13	56
13.	U. of Massachusetts	2.56	1.01	55
14.	U. of Illinois	2.67	1.16	75
15.	Purdue University	2.76	.98	70
16.	U. of Missouri	2.78	1.14	49
17.	U. of Southern California	2.79	1.09	62
18.	Temple University	2.84	1.08	51
19.	U. of Oregon	2.98	1.29	46
20.	Ohio University	3.02	1.02	59
21.	Wayne State U.	3.11	1.11	45
22.	Florida State U.	3.14	1.27	55
23.	U. of Nebraska	3.22	1.02	50
24.	Southern Illinois U.	3.29	1.01	58
25.	U. of Arizona	3.33	1.10	48
26.	Bowling Green State U.	3.42	1.18	48
27.	U. of Florida	3.57	1.25	42
28.	Kent State U.	3.62	1.14	37
29.	U. of Colorado	3.69	1.16	52
30.	U. of Tennessee	3.91	1.33	32
31.	North Texas State U.	4.00	1.41	28

TABLE 6. COMMUNICATION EDUCATION, RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Wisconsin	2.47	.95	51
2.	U. of Texas	2.48	.95	50
3.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.49	1.04	47
4.	U. of Oklahoma	2.74	.98	38
5.	Temple University	2.80	1.00	39
6.	Florida State U.	2.84	1.19	45
6.	U. of Illinois	2.84	1.28	50
8.	West Virginia U.	2.87	1.34	47
9.	U. of Kansas	2.88	1.18	43
9.	U. of Nebraska	2.88	1.00	41
11.	U. of Washington	2.95	1.21	38
12.	U. of Missouri	3.04	.90	27
13.	Ohio University	3.21	.98	34
13.	U. of Oregon	3.21	.96	33
15.	Wayne State U.	3.41	1.08	34
16.	U. of Arizona	3.43	1.10	28
17.	Southern Illinois U.	3.44	.96	43
18.	U. of Florida	3.90	1.32	30
19.	North Texas State U.	4.05	1.53	21
20.	U. of Tennessee	4.09	1.19	22
21.	Rennselaer Poly. Inst.	4.10	1.52	19

TABLE 7. ORAL INTERPRETATION, RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	Northwestern University	1.43	.67	100
2.	Louisiana State U.	2.46	1.16	43
3.	U. of Illinois	2.55	1.23	53
4.	U. of Texas	2.63	1.14	57
5.	Southern Illinois U.	2.81	1.34	53
6.	U. of Arizona	3.05	1.27	43
7.	Pennsylvania State U.	3.28	1.28	40
8.	U. of Minnesota	3.29	1.27	34
9.	Wayne State U.	3.50	1.16	38
10.	North Texas State U.	3.97	1.43	31
11.	U. of Florida	4.34	1.26	29

TABLE 8. RATINGS OF OVERALL QUALITY, RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Wisconsin	1.78	.85	96
2.	U. of Iowa	1.81	.84	106
3.	Northwestern University	1.82	.76	119
4.	U. of Illinois	1.95	.86	100
5.	U. of Texas	2.14	.76	88
6.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.19	.83	83
7.	U. of Minnesota	2.26	.81	87
8.	Purdue University	2.35	.83	100
9.	U. of Utah	2.38	.87	77
10.	Indiana University	2.39	.92	89
11.	Ohio State U.	2.45	.78	96
12.	U. of Kansas	2.54	.96	83
13.	U. of Washington	2.60	.81	60
14.	U. of Massachusetts	2.66	.85	74
15.	Temple University	2.70	.91	76
16.	Florida State U.	2.99	1.13	69
17.	Ohio University	3.12	1.00	75
18.	U. of Missouri	3.13	.92	53
18.	U. of Oklahoma	3.13	.98	53
20.	U. of Nebraska	3.18	.90	62
21.	U. of Oregon	3.19	1.14	57
22.	U. of Maryland	3.33	.93	57
23.	Southern Illinois U.	3.36	.90	75
24.	U. of Arizona	3.48	1.04	61
25.	Wayne State U.	3.55	1.05	60
26.	Bowling Green State U.	3.59	1.14	64
27.	SUNY, Buffalo	3.61	.97	41
28.	U. of Colorado	3.66	1.11	59
29.	U. of Kentucky	3.70	1.08	56
30.	U. of Florida	3.79	1.13	53
31.	Kent State U.	3.84	1.11	50
32.	Rennselaer Poly. Inst.	3.93	1.46	28
33.	U. of Tennessee	4.24	1.06	37
34.	North Texas State U.	4.32	1.20	34

TABLE 9. RANKINGS OF OVERALL QUALITY, RANDOM SAMPLE

	School	n	$\bar{X}$
1.	Northwestern University	64	2.84
2.	U. of Iowa	60	2.43
3.	U. of Wisconsin	58	2.69
4.	U. of Illinois	45	2.82
5.	U. of Texas	36	3.17
6.	Michigan State U.	31	2.81
7.	Purdue University	31	3.32
8.	U. of Minnesota	28	3.14
9.	Pennsylvania State U.	24	3.25
10.	U. of Utah	23	3.65
11.	Indiana University	23	3.68
12.	Ohio State U.	17	3.41
13.	U. of Kansas	10	3.80
14.	U. of Arizona	8	3.00
15.	Temple University	7	3.28
16.	Florida State University	5	2.40
17.	Southern Illinois U.	5	3.40
17.	U. of Southern Calif.	5	3.40
19.	Ohio University	5	3.80
20.	U. of Massachusetts	5	4.20
20.	U. of Washington	5	4.20

TABLE 10. RHETORICAL AND COMMUNICATION THEORY, FIRST AUTHORS

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Iowa	1.41	.73	69
2.	U. of Wisconsin	1.49	.99	67
3.	Northwestern U.	1.78	.78	71
4.	U. of Minnesota	1.79	.94	66
5.	U. of Illinois	1.94	1.25	71
6.	U. of Texas	2.02	.87	61
7.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.03	.95	68
8.	U. of Massachusetts	2.18	1.02	61
9.	U. of Utah	2.23	1.13	56
10.	Temple University	2.32	1.08	56
11.	Indiana University	2.36	1.20	59
12.	U. of Kansas	2.37	.96	59
13.	U. of Washington	2.40	.96	57
14.	U. of Pittsburgh	2.63	1.05	54
15.	Purdue University	2.64	1.04	64
16.	Ohio State U.	2.69	1.09	61
17.	U. of Maryland	2.98	1.14	45
18.	Carnegie-Mellon U.	3.00	1.16	31
19.	Southern Illinois U.	3.10	.98	49
19.	Louisiana State U.	3.10	1.19	48
21.	U. of Denver	3.20	1.28	54
22.	U. of Nebraska	3.28	.95	53
23.	Wayne State U.	3.40	.92	47
24.	U. of Missouri	3.44	1.10	43
25.	Florida State U.	3.51	1.24	51
26.	U. of Oklahoma	3.56	.93	43
27.	Bowling Green State U.	3.60	1.05	43
27.	U. of California,Berkeley	3.60	1.29	45
27.	U. of Colorado	3.60	1.14	52
30.	U. of Oregon	3.69	1.00	39
31.	Rensselaer Poly. Inst.	3.79	1.37	28
32.	Ohio University	3.84	.81	43
33.	Kent State U.	3.90	.92	38
34.	U. of Arizona	3.92	1.09	48
35.	U. of Kentucky	3.95	1.02	39
36.	SUNY, Buffalo	4.06	1.19	35
37.	U. of Florida	4.36	1.05	36
38.	U. of Tennessee	4.55	1.06	31
39.	Howard University	4.86	1.04	28
40.	North Texas State U.	4.88	.97	25

TABLE 11. INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION, FIRST AUTHORS

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	Michigan State U.	1.55	.91	60
2.	U. of Illinois	1.59	.88	66
3.	U. of Wisconsin	2.25	.92	63
4.	Purdue University	2.27	1.04	62
5.	U. of Utah	2.30	1.06	56
6.	Northwestern U.	2.32	.97	62
6.	U. of Kansas	2.32	1.01	63
8.	U. of Massachusetts	2.34	1.08	58
9.	U. of Washington	2.45	.82	53
10.	Temple University	2.47	1.01	51
11.	U. of Texas	2.63	.99	57
12.	Ohio State U.	2.70	1.01	56
13.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.73	1.15	62
14.	U. of Iowa	2.75	1.24	57
15.	U. of Minnesota	2.77	1.12	57
15.	West Virginia U.	2.77	1.20	52
17.	Indiana U.	2.83	1.28	52
18.	U. of Denver	3.11	.83	45
18.	U. of Nebraska	3.11	1.05	47
20.	Florida State U.	3.17	1.07	41
21.	SUNY, Albany	3.21	1.40	38
22.	Ohio University	3.26	1.00	46
23.	U. of Southern Calif.	3.37	1.00	46
24.	U. of Kentucky	3.40	1.16	45
25.	U. of Pittsburgh	3.42	1.16	41
26.	U. of Oklahoma	3.44	.88	43
27.	Bowling Green State U.	3.50	.93	40
27.	Southern Illinois U.	3.50	.99	40
29.	Wayne State U.	3.60	.98	40
30.	U. of Maryland	3.61	1.05	36
31.	Kent State U.	3.64	.92	31
32.	Annenberg School, West	3.75	1.19	24
33.	U. of Oregon	3.81	1.08	37
34.	SUNY, Buffalo	3.87	1.18	31
35.	U. of Arizona	4.13	1.23	38
36.	Rensselaer Poly. Inst.	4.22	1.28	23
36.	U. of Florida	4.22	.87	32
38.	U. of Tennessee	4.59	1.08	27
39.	North Texas State U.	4.77	.97	22

TABLE 12. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION, FIRST AUTHORS

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	Purdue University	1.69	1.06	68
2.	Michigan State U.	1.77	1.13	52
3.	U. of Texas	2.53	1.10	49
4.	U. of Utah	2.65	1.42	40
5.	U. of Kansas	2.73	1.18	48
6.	U. of Minnesota	2.83	1.31	53
7.	U. of Illinois	2.98	1.38	51
8.	U. of Washington	3.08	.89	40
9.	Indiana University	3.10	1.11	41
10.	Ohio State U.	3.15	1.16	47
11.	U. of Maryland	3.19	1.13	37
12.	Ohio University	3.26	1.16	39
13.	U. of Oklahoma	3.29	.98	38
14.	Temple University	3.32	1.16	37
14.	U. of Wisconsin	3.32	1.25	47
16.	SUNY, Buffalo	3.34	1.18	32
17.	U. of Denver	3.38	1.10	40
18.	Annenberg School, West	3.44	1.16	27
19.	West Virginia U.	3.50	1.30	40
20.	U. of Nebraska	3.53	.95	38
21.	Northwestern U.	3.55	1.08	47
22.	Pennsylvania State U.	3.58	1.44	45
23.	U. of Iowa	3.63	1.50	46
24.	U. of Southern California	3.71	1.04	45
25.	Florida State U.	3.73	1.13	33
25.	Wayne State U.	3.73	1.01	33
27.	Bowling Green State U.	3.81	.95	36
27.	Kent State U.	3.81	1.20	26
29.	SUNY, Albany	3.88	1.59	34
29.	U. of Kentucky	3.88	1.26	32
31.	U. of Oregon	4.13	1.04	30
32.	Rensselaer Poly. Inst.	4.18	1.37	22
33.	Oklahoma State U.	4.20	1.32	15
34.	U. of Arizona	4.24	1.20	33
35.	U. of Colorado	4.29	1.02	42
36.	U. of Florida	4.32	.82	28
37.	Howard University	4.95	1.02	21

TABLE 13. RADIO-TV-FILM (MASS COMMUNICATION), FIRST AUTHORS

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Iowa	1.90	.97	41
2.	U. of Wisconsin	1.98	1.01	45
3.	U. of Texas	2.28	1.18	43
4.	Ohio State U.	2.58	.77	36
5.	Indiana University	2.61	1.14	31
6.	Michigan State U.	2.63	1.28	35
6.	U. of Illinois	2.63	1.22	38
8.	U. of Utah	2.74	1.26	31
9.	Temple University	2.82	1.25	28
10.	U. of Minnesota	2.85	.97	26
11.	Northwestern U.	2.86	1.13	37
12.	New York University	2.88	1.11	17
13.	U. of Massachusetts	3.00	.91	30
14.	Pennsylvania State U.	3.03	1.20	31
15.	U. of Maryland	3.25	1.26	24
16.	Ohio University	3.44	.99	23
17.	Florida State U.	3.46	1.14	22
18.	U. of Missouri	3.48	1.12	23
19.	U. of Kentucky	3.61	1.37	23
20.	Wayne State U.	3.67	1.21	27
21.	Purdue University	3.73	1.28	26
22.	U. of Oregon	3.88	1.03	26
23.	U. of Colorado	4.00	1.36	28
24.	Bowling Green State U.	4.05	.85	19
25.	U. of Tennessee	4.17	1.34	18
26.	SUNY, Buffalo	4.47	1.17	19
27.	SUNY, Albany	4.48	1.21	21
28.	North Texas State U.	5.00	1.00	13

TABLE 14. PUBLIC ADDRESS, FIRST AUTHORS

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Iowa	1.52	.72	63
2.	U. of Wisconsin	1.56	.69	64
3.	Indiana University	1.82	.91	54
4.	Northwestern University	2.06	.95	63
5.	U. of Minnesota	2.07	.86	55
6.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.20	.87	59
7.	U. of Massachusetts	2.45	1.19	53
8.	U. of Kansas	2.47	1.05	53
9.	U. of Pittsburgh	2.49	1.10	49
10.	U. of Texas	2.56	1.11	52
11.	Louisiana State U.	2.58	1.01	48
12.	Ohio State U.	2.64	1.04	55
13.	U. of Washington	2.84	1.01	44
14.	U. of Southern Calif.	2.88	1.01	49
15.	U. of Missouri	2.91	1.14	44
16.	Temple University	3.14	1.07	42
17.	Purdue University	3.18	1.12	55
18.	Wayne State U.	3.29	.87	41
19.	U. of Illinois	3.37	1.29	67
20.	U. of Nebraska	3.50	.91	46
21.	U. of Oregon	3.54	1.10	37
22.	Florida State U.	3.59	1.13	34
23.	Southern Illinois U.	3.60	1.13	42
24.	Bowling Green State U.	3.88	.91	34
25.	U. of Arizona	3.90	1.11	38
26.	Ohio University	4.02	.92	40
27.	Kent State U.	4.10	.87	31
28.	U. of Colorado	4.14	1.13	44
29.	U. of Florida	4.41	1.02	29
30.	U. of Tennessee	4.64	1.06	28
31.	North Texas State U.	4.74	1.18	23

TABLE 15. COMMUNICATION EDUCATION, FIRST AUTHORS

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Wisconsin	2.32	1.06	41
2.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.69	1.30	39
3.	U. of Texas	2.76	1.12	38
4.	West Virginia U.	2.92	1.27	36
5.	U. of Nebraska	2.95	1.17	42
6.	U. of Washington	2.97	1.13	36
7.	Temple U.	3.07	1.36	29
8.	U. of Kansas	3.08	.87	36
8.	U. of Oklahoma	3.08	1.30	38
10.	Florida State U.	3.42	.90	26
11.	U. of Illinois	3.43	1.26	44
12.	U. of Missouri	3.47	.86	30
13.	Wayne State U.	3.50	1.14	26
14.	Ohio U.	3.74	.81	27
15.	Southern Illinois U.	3.87	.97	30
16.	U. of Oregon	4.00	.93	24
17.	U. of Arizona	4.33	1.07	27
18.	North Texas State U.	4.58	1.17	19
19.	U. of Florida	4.61	.84	23
20.	U. of Tennessee	4.72	1.02	18
21.	Rensselaer Polytechnic I.	4.86	1.23	14

TABLE 16. ORAL INTERPRETATION, FIRST AUTHORS

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	Northwestern Universitv	1.48	.75	59
2.	U. of Texas	2.66	1.30	35
3.	Louisiana State U.	2.75	1.11	32
4.	Southern Illinois U.	3.03	1.36	34
5.	U. of Illinois	3.17	1.46	35
6.	U. of Arizona	3.52	1.43	29
7.	Pennsylvania State U.	3.77	1.34	22
8.	U. of Minnesota	3.91	1.09	21
9.	Wayne State U.	4.09	1.12	23
10.	North Texas State U.	4.44	1.42	18
11.	U. of Florida	4.76	1.03	17

TABLE 17. RATINGS OF OVERALL QUALITY, FIRST AUTHORS

	School	$\bar{X}$	s.d.	n
1.	U. of Wisconsin	1.66	.74	71
2.	U. of Iowa	1.70	.71	70
3.	U. of Illinois	1.84	.87	69
4.	Northwestern University	1.93	.76	71
5.	U. of Texas	2.29	.80	66
6.	U. of Minnesota	2.30	.68	67
7.	Indiana University	2.35	.76	63
8.	Purdue University	2.41	.90	68
9.	Pennsylvania State U.	2.43	.90	65
10.	U. of Utah	2.49	.98	55
11.	U. of Massachusetts	2.54	.86	66
12.	U. of Kansas	2.61	.85	64
13.	Ohio State U.	2.70	.84	61
14.	U. of Washington	2.71	.74	55
15.	Temple University	2.87	.92	53
16.	U. of Nebraska	3.39	.79	59
17.	Southern Illinois U.	3.42	.84	53
18.	Florida State U.	3.43	.96	51
19.	U. of Maryland	3.46	.96	46
20.	U. of Oklahoma	3.53	.79	20
21.	U. of Missouri	3.62	.87	47
21.	Wayne State U.	3.62	.78	50
23.	Ohio University	3.63	.76	49
24.	U. of Oregon	3.70	.88	40
25.	Bowling Green State U.	3.72	.85	47
26.	Kent State U.	3.82	.90	40
27.	U. of Kentucky	3.86	1.02	49
28.	U. of Colorado	3.98	1.03	51
29.	SUNY, Buffalo	4.08	.95	37
30.	U. of Arizona	4.13	.82	45
31.	U. of Florida	4.33	.90	45
32.	Rensselaer Poly. Inst.	4.41	1.15	27
33.	U. of Tennessee	4.71	.91	34
34.	North Texas State U.	4.86	1.24	28

TABLE 18. RANKINGS OF OVERALL QUALITY, FIRST AUTHORS

	School	n	$\bar{X}$
1.	U. of Wisconsin	43	2.44
2.	U. of Iowa	41	2.54
3.	U. of Illinois	32	2.59
4.	Northwestern University	31	3.26
5.	U. of Texas	26	3.31
6.	Pennsylvania State U.	19	2.53
7.	Michigan State U.	19	2.53
8.	U. of Minnesota	17	3.65
9.	U. of Utah	13	4.23
10.	Indiana University	12	3.75
11.	U. of Massachusetts	9	4.22
12.	U. of Kansas	8	3.38
13.	Purdue University	5	3.60
13.	Ohio State U.	5	4.00